

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-23, 25, 26, 28 and 29 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 20, 22, 26, and 28 are amended. No new matter has been introduced. Reexamination and reconsideration of the present application are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated June 3, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-10, 12-23, 25, 26, 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Woods et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0087692 (hereinafter Woods) or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Woods. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in view of the claims as amended.

### **Independent claim 1, as amended now recites:**

A method for caching web addresses comprising:  
monitoring, by a network interface, traffic on a network;  
extracting, by a filter, web addresses from the monitored traffic;  
storing, by a database, the extracted web addresses;  
querying, by a network device, the database, the querying returning zero or more web addresses to the network device; and  
categorizing, by a categorization mechanism, the extracted web addresses based at least in part on content of a webpage associated with each of the web, *wherein the categorization mechanism scans metatags of the webpage to assess the content of the webpage.*

The Woods reference is directed to a system for monitoring Internet access by a client. (*Woods; Abstract*) The Jones reference discloses a monitoring server which maintains a database of permissible content on at least one website and an intervening control layer which restricts access to websites based on whether the web address is permitted by the monitoring server. (*Woods; Paragraphs 7, 9, and 24-27*)

The Woods reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the method specified in independent claim 1, as amended. Unlike the method specified in claim 1, as amended, Woods does not teach “categorizing, by a categorization mechanism, the extracted web addresses based

at least in part on content of a webpage associated with each of the web, *wherein the categorization mechanism scans metatags of the webpage to assess the content of the webpage.*” Instead, Wood teaches that web addresses and the content are categorized as permissible or not permissible based on whether the web address is included in a database.

(Woods; Paragraph 25) Specifically, Woods discloses that when the server “receives a request from client 200 as to whether content at a given URL address is permitted to be accessed, server 204 determines whether the address is in the database, indicating that the content at this address is permissible.” (Woods; Paragraph 25) Independent claim 1 is distinct from the method disclosed in Woods because Woods assesses the content of the webpage by comparing the web address for the webpage to entries in a database according to predetermined categories of content, which is not the same as scanning the metatags of a webpage to assess its content. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, as amended distinguishes over the Woods reference.

Independent claims 10, 20, 22, 26 and 28, as amended all recite limitations similar to independent claim 1, as amended. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 10, 20, 22, 26 and 28, distinguish over Woods for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, as amended.

Claims 3-9, 12-19, 21, 23, 25, and 29 depend from independent claims 1, 10, 20, 22, and 28, as amended, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 3-9, 12-19, 21, 23, 25, and 29 all distinguish over Woods for the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 10, 20, 22, and 28, as amended, respectively.

///

///

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 488-7100 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance should the Examiner believe that such a telephone conference call would advance prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

Date: August 15, 2005

By: 

Roger R. Wise  
Registration No. 31,204  
Customer No. 27496

725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800  
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5406  
Telephone: (213) 488-7100  
Facsimile: (213) 629-1033